The Editor
Med Trib

TX RC RO

A propos your editorial on "Cyclamate":

- 1. The Nature commentator plainly did not have available the elementary facts and scientific recommendations on which the ban on cyclamate was based. A legitimate complaint can indeed be lodged against the failure to give clearer publicity to these considerations.
- 2. You compare the conclusions about cyclamates adversely in relation to cigarette smoking. Certainly, the campaign against tobacco has suffered from the most irrational and self-serving evasions; but this is no excuse for doing the same again.

I agree about the relative strength of the evidence against tobacco being much stronger; however, I might also recall that only after the most extensive efforts has it been possible to inculpate the carcinogenicity of inhaled tobacco smoke, and this only very recently.

Your complacency about the harmlessness of cyclamates "after wide use in this country for at least 15 years" might well allay my own skepticism if you could point to any large scale epidemiological studies on the subject covering such a petiod of exposure. The difficulty of attempting such a task makes the hazard all the more insidious.

3. Please feal free to putrish the above or fair extracts from the attacked.